



A legal analysis of International Instrument for the protection of property

Y S Uthman

Associate Professor, Department of Private and Property Law, Faculty of Law, University of Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

Property rights have long occupied a central position within legal systems due to their importance in safeguarding individual autonomy, promoting economic development, and ensuring social stability. In modern legal discourse, the protection of property is no longer confined solely to domestic legal frameworks but has also become an important concern of international law. The increasing recognition of property rights at the international level reflects the understanding that secure property ownership contributes to economic growth, investment confidence, and the protection of human dignity. Consequently, several international instruments have been developed to establish standards aimed at protecting individuals and entities from arbitrary deprivation of property while ensuring that state actions affecting property rights are carried out in accordance with the law. These instruments, which exist at both global and regional levels, recognize the right to own property either individually or in association with others and impose obligations on states to respect and protect such rights. They also provide safeguards against unlawful expropriation and often require that where property is taken for public purposes, such actions must be accompanied by lawful procedures and adequate compensation. In addition, international legal frameworks increasingly acknowledge that property protection extends beyond traditional forms of tangible property to include other proprietary interests that may be recognized under law. The interaction between international norms and domestic legal systems also raises important questions regarding implementation, enforcement, and the extent to which international standards influence national legal policies. These considerations highlight the growing significance of international legal instruments in shaping the protection of property and underscore the need for continuous evaluation of their effectiveness within the broader framework of international law.

Keywords: Property law, international law, international treaties, property protection

Introduction

Protection of property rights is one of the most important priorities of any rule of law ^[1]. Property rights occupy a central position in legal systems across the world due to their significance in promoting economic stability, individual autonomy, and social order. The ability of individuals and entities to acquire, own, use, and transfer property has long been regarded as an essential element of legal protection and a vital component of socio-economic development. Within traditional legal frameworks, the regulation and protection of property were largely matters determined by domestic law, with national legal systems defining the nature, scope, and enforcement of proprietary rights. However, developments in international law, particularly in the field of human rights, have gradually expanded the recognition of property rights beyond national boundaries, thereby elevating their status within the broader framework of international legal protection. The emergence of international standards relating to property protection reflects the growing recognition that secure property rights are indispensable to economic development, social stability, and the protection of individual dignity. As international relations became increasingly interconnected, the need for universally recognized legal principles governing the protection of property became more pronounced. Consequently, the international community has developed a range of legal instruments designed to safeguard property rights and to protect individuals and entities from arbitrary or unlawful deprivation of their proprietary interests ^[2]. These instruments establish normative standards that guide

the conduct of states and affirm the principle that property rights deserve recognition and protection within the international legal order.

Prominent among these instruments is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes the right of every individual to own property and prohibits arbitrary deprivation of such property. In addition to global instruments, several regional human rights frameworks have incorporated provisions that specifically address the protection of property. Notable examples include the European Convention on Human Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights, and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. These instruments collectively contribute to the development of a body of international norms that affirm the importance of property protection while recognizing that such rights may, in certain circumstances, be subject to lawful limitations in the public interest.

The protection of property under international law therefore reflects an attempt to balance two important considerations. On the one hand, international legal norms seek to safeguard individuals and entities against arbitrary interference with their proprietary interests. On the other hand, these norms acknowledge the authority of states to regulate property within their territories in pursuit of legitimate public objectives such as economic development, land reform, and environmental protection. Within this framework, international instruments serve as important sources of legal standards that shape the evolving protection of property rights in the contemporary international legal order.

Concept of Property in Law

Property, in legal terms, refers to a recognized and enforceable interest or right in things, whether tangible or intangible, that allows an individual or entity to use, enjoy, and control those things to the exclusion of others. In law, property is not simply about physical ownership; it encompasses a bundle of rights, obligations, and relationships recognized by legal systems, which provide a framework for determining who may possess, use, transfer, or benefit from certain resources.

The concept of property is traditionally divided into two main categories: real property and personal property. Real property, often referred to as immovable property, includes land and structures attached to it. Personal property, or movable property, encompasses goods, money, and intangible rights such as shares, patents, and debts. Legal systems further distinguish property rights as legal or equitable, providing varying degrees of protection and enforcement depending on the nature of the interest held [3].

The right to property is widely regarded as one of the earliest and most fundamental rights recognized in human society. Long before legal systems developed sophisticated classifications such as real rights and personal rights, the notion that individuals could possess, control, and make use of certain things had already emerged as a basic social reality. In early human communities, people naturally laid claim to land, tools, animals, and other resources necessary for survival and livelihood. Although these claims were not initially expressed through formal legal language or institutions, they reflected an underlying understanding that individuals and groups could exercise authority over certain possessions. In this sense, the concept of property existed in practice long before the development of legal doctrines that later attempted to define and regulate it.

Over time, philosophers and legal theorists began to conceptualize property not merely as a social arrangement but as a natural right inherent in human existence. Thinkers within the natural law tradition argued that the right to own property flows from the relationship between human labour, personal autonomy, and the resources provided by nature. According to this view, individuals acquire legitimate claims to property through their efforts and interaction with the natural environment, and such claims deserve recognition and protection within legal systems. Consequently, property came to be regarded as a fundamental right that supports personal independence, economic activity, and social stability.

Because property is closely connected to human survival, power, and wealth, disputes over ownership, control, and distribution have been present throughout the history of human civilization. Conflicts over land, resources, inheritance, and territorial control have shaped social relations, political systems, and legal development across different societies. These controversies have prompted the creation of various legal rules and institutions designed to regulate property relations, protect ownership, and resolve competing claims. Thus, debates surrounding property rights are nearly as old as humanity itself, reflecting the enduring significance of property in the organization of society and the evolution of legal systems.

1. Legal Basis of Property Protection in International Law

Property rights have historically been created and defined by National law. As a matter of international law, each nation is viewed as having sovereignty over its territory,

which includes the right to adopt its own laws regarding property within that territory [4]. Property rights exist only to the extent that they are recognized by the national government. As Jeremy Bentham famously explained: "Property and law are born together, and die together. Before laws were made there was no property; take away laws, and property ceases." In this sense, property law stems from a vertical relationship between the state, on the one hand, and its citizens, on the other. In contrast, classic international law was public law. It governed only the interactions among nations, not the rights of individual citizens within such nations. Thus, it reflected what might be seen as a horizontal relationship among different nations. Certainly, fragments of this body of international law did affect property rights.

The protection of property under international law is founded on a network of international treaties, customary international law, and general principles of law recognized by the international community. These legal frameworks collectively establish standards that safeguard individuals and entities from arbitrary deprivation of property and ensure that states respect and protect property rights within their jurisdictions.

One of the principal foundations of property protection in international law is international human rights law. A key instrument is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), which recognizes property as a fundamental human right. Article 17 of the declaration provides that everyone has the right to own property individually as well as in association with others, and that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of their property. Although the declaration itself is not legally binding, it has greatly influenced subsequent international treaties and national legal systems [5].

Another significant legal basis is found in regional human rights instruments. For example, the European Convention on Human Rights protects property rights through Protocol 1, Article 1, which guarantees the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. Similarly, the American Convention on Human Rights recognizes the right to property and sets limitations on the circumstances under which property may be expropriated. In Africa, the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights provides that the right to property shall be guaranteed and may only be encroached upon in the interest of public need and in accordance with appropriate laws.

Beyond human rights instruments, international investment law also forms an important basis for property protection. Bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and multilateral agreements protect the property interests of foreign investors against unlawful expropriation by host states. These agreements typically require that any expropriation must be carried out for a public purpose, in a non-discriminatory manner, and with prompt, adequate, and effective compensation.

International dispute settlement mechanisms such as arbitration tribunals and international courts play a crucial role in enforcing these legal protections. Through their decisions, these bodies interpret and apply international legal rules relating to property protection, thereby strengthening the global framework that governs property rights.

2. Key International Instruments

There are several international instruments on land rights. A number of them are tied to land governance [6], gender,

agriculture, environment, and poverty eradication or economic empowerment. Some of these but not limited to includes; Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, Article 17), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), African Charter on Human & People's Rights, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP, Article 26(2)), The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) 1981, International Labour Organisations Article 169, etc.

2.1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights

"Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."^[7] This provision, though brief, encapsulates two essential dimensions of the right to property: the positive entitlement to own, and the negative guarantee against arbitrary deprivation. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted in 1948, serves as a foundational international instrument for property protection primarily through Article 17, which establishes that everyone has the right to own property alone or in association with others and that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of their property. Although the UDHR is a declaration rather than a legally binding treaty, it has influenced international law by setting a universal standard, guiding the drafting of binding treaties, and shaping regional human rights jurisprudence.

According to Cheneval^[8], the chronological progress of the awareness of human rights is closely associated to the right to private (individual or common) property, especially of indigenous peoples. Wollstonecraft, observed that: "Nature authorizes and reason sanctions ... the right a man has to enjoy the acquisitions which his talents and industry have acquired; and to bequeath them to whom he chooses."

The right to property relates to private entities, individual and communal form of ownerships. However, the UDHR did emphasize on the absolute nature of the rights to property hence, the right can be derogated in circumstances where it is necessary to forestall public interest and public policies though, while such derogative power is applied, it is obligatory to avoid illogical, arbitrary and reckless behaviour.

The inclusion of the right to property in the UDHR was not uncontroversial. Cold War ideological divisions between Western liberal states and socialist bloc countries made consensus on property rights particularly fraught. The socialist states were reluctant to enshrine a right that could be interpreted as legitimising capitalist accumulation. The compromise achieved in Article 17^[9] — protecting property while prohibiting only 'arbitrary' deprivation — reflects this tension and helps explain why property rights were ultimately excluded from the two binding International Covenants of 1966 (the ICCPR and the ICESCR).

Despite its non-binding character, the UDHR has attained significant normative authority. Many scholars contend that the Declaration, or significant parts thereof, have crystallised into customary international law, thereby acquiring legal force. Whether or not this view is accepted, the UDHR continues to exert a powerful influence on the interpretation of treaty-based property rights and on the development of national constitutions and legislation.

2.2. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP)

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is a key international instrument (adopted 2007) that establishes minimum standards for protecting indigenous property, specifically recognizing collective rights to lands, territories, and natural resources. It protects against forced displacement and requires free, prior, and informed consent for activities on indigenous lands.

Among its most significant provisions are Articles 26 to 30, which establish a detailed framework for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights to land, territories, and natural resources. These provisions recognize that land and natural resources are central to the cultural survival, identity, economic development, and spiritual life of indigenous communities.

Article 26, particularly Article 26(2), affirms that indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop, and control the lands, territories, and resources that they traditionally possess, occupy, or otherwise utilize. This provision acknowledges that indigenous communities often maintain longstanding relationships with their ancestral lands based on customary systems of ownership and management that may not always be formally recognized under domestic legal frameworks. Consequently, Article 26(3) imposes an obligation on states to give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories, and resources, with due respect to the customs, traditions, and land tenure systems of the indigenous peoples concerned. This recognition is essential because many indigenous communities rely on customary laws and traditional governance structures to regulate land use and resource management^[10].

The Declaration further strengthens these rights by requiring states to respect indigenous peoples' traditional systems of land tenure and resource control. This means that governments must not only acknowledge indigenous ownership but must also ensure that legal and administrative frameworks adequately protect such rights against encroachment, exploitation, or arbitrary acquisition. The aim is to safeguard indigenous lands from external interference, particularly in situations where governments or private entities seek to exploit natural resources such as minerals, forests, or water bodies located within indigenous territories.

Articles 27 and 28 complement Article 26 by providing mechanisms for redress where indigenous land rights have been violated. Article 27 requires states to establish fair, independent, and transparent processes to recognize and adjudicate indigenous land claims, taking into account indigenous laws, customs, traditions, and land tenure systems. Article 28 further provides that indigenous peoples have the right to restitution or, where restitution is not possible, fair and equitable compensation for lands, territories, and resources that have been confiscated, taken, occupied, used, or damaged without their free, prior, and informed consent. Such compensation may take various forms, including the return of equivalent lands or financial compensation, depending on the circumstances.

2.3. International Labour Organisation's Convention 169

International Labour Organisation (ILO Convention No. 169) sets out the responsibilities of member states in safeguarding the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples^[11].

Within the Convention, Part II, particularly Articles 13 to 15, provides specific provisions concerning the protection of indigenous peoples' lands and territories. These articles emphasize the importance of respecting the special relationship that indigenous communities maintain with their traditional lands and natural resources ^[12].

In particular, Article 14 recognizes that:

1. The rights of ownership and possession of the peoples concerned over the lands which they traditionally occupy shall be recognized. In addition, measures shall be taken in appropriate cases to safeguard the right of the peoples concerned to use lands not exclusively occupied by them but to which they have traditionally had access for their subsistence and traditional activities. Particular attention shall be paid to the situation of nomadic peoples and shifting cultivators in this respect.
2. Governments shall take steps as necessary to identify the lands which the peoples concerned traditionally occupy and to guarantee effective protection of their rights of ownership and possession.

This provision acknowledges that the survival, culture, and economic well-being of indigenous peoples are closely tied to their control over their ancestral lands and the natural resources found within them.

2.4. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)

Also regarded as Banjul Charter, protects property through Article 14, which guarantees the right to property and stipulates that encroachment is only allowed for public need or in the general interest, in accordance with appropriate laws. It also guarantees the rights to free disposal of wealth and natural resources for peoples.

Article 21 provides thus;

1. All peoples shall freely dispose of their wealth and natural resources. This right shall be exercised in the exclusive interest of the people. In no case shall a people be deprived of it.
2. In case of spoliation the dispossessed people shall have the right to the lawful recovery of its property as well as to an adequate compensation.
3. The free disposal of wealth and natural resources shall be exercised without prejudice to the obligation of promoting international economic co-operation based on mutual respect, equitable exchange and the principle of international law.
4. States Parties to the present Charter shall individually and collectively exercise the rights to free disposal of their wealth and natural resources with a view to strengthening African Unity and solidarity.
5. States Parties to the present Charter shall undertake to eliminate all forms of foreign economic exploitation particularly that practised by international monopolies so as to enable their peoples to fully benefit from the advantage derived from their national resources ^[13].

The interpretation and enforcement of these provisions are primarily undertaken by the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights. These bodies have played a crucial role in clarifying the scope of property protection under the Charter through their jurisprudence. In several landmark decisions,

they have emphasized that property rights include not only individual ownership but also communal land rights and traditional land tenure systems. This has been particularly important in protecting the land rights of indigenous and local communities that may not hold formal legal title under domestic laws.

2.5. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

It represents a major international legal instrument aimed at eliminating discrimination against women in all spheres of life. The Convention recognizes that widespread discrimination against women continues to exist and affirms that such discrimination undermines the principles of equality of rights and respect for human dignity. Under Article 1 of the Convention, discrimination against women is defined as any distinction, exclusion, or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying women's recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil, or any other field. In response to this reality, the Convention affirms the principle of equality by requiring States Parties to adopt all appropriate measures, including legislative and policy reforms, to ensure the full development and advancement of women. The objective is to guarantee that women are able to exercise and enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men.

A review of these international instruments reveals that they largely pursue similar objectives and embody closely related principles. Many of them reiterate the fundamental idea that individuals should not be unjustly deprived of the right to own, use, or enjoy their land and property. They emphasize that land rights should not be arbitrarily restricted, denied, or interfered with through forced eviction or compulsory acquisition without due process, consultation, and adequate compensation. In this way, these instruments collectively seek to promote security of tenure and equitable access to land and property ^[14].

Consequently, states that are parties to these instruments are expected to incorporate their provisions into domestic legal frameworks, including national constitutions, statutes, and public policies. Such incorporation ensures that the protections recognized at the international level are reflected and enforceable within national legal systems. Furthermore, governments are encouraged to recognize and respect the customary land practices of different communities, particularly where land carries deep spiritual, cultural, social, and moral significance. The denial of such rights does not merely affect property interests but may also undermine the identity, dignity, and existence of the affected communities.

2.6. The European Convention on Human Rights (1952)

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights constitutes the most elaborately developed treaty protection of property rights in any international human rights instrument. The provision states: "Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems

necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”

For instance, in *Howard v United Kingdom* ^[15], a public authority wanted to use a compulsory purchase order to acquire a property for development. The European Court of Human Rights held that the question was whether the authority had struck a fair balance between the rights of the individual property owners and the rights of the community. One of the main factors in any such balance will be the availability of compensation reflecting the value of the property acquired by the authority.

The Court has consistently held that states enjoy a wide margin of appreciation in determining what is in the public interest, particularly in matters of social and economic policy. However, this margin is not unlimited. Where a measure imposes an ‘excessive individual burden’ — depriving the applicant of property without adequate compensation and without procedural safeguards.

2.7. The American Convention on Human Rights (1969)

It is also known as Pact of San José. It protects property rights under Article 21, establishing the right to the use and enjoyment of property, including protection against arbitrary deprivation. It permits expropriation only for public utility or social interest, subject to fair compensation.

Article 21^[16] provides thus;

1. Everyone has the right to the use and enjoyment of his property. The law may subordinate such use and enjoyment to the interest of society.
2. No one shall be deprived of his property except upon payment of just compensation, for reasons of public utility or social interest, and in the cases and according to the forms established by law.
3. Usury and any other form of exploitation of man by man shall be prohibited by law.

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights has developed a particularly progressive jurisprudence on property rights, with special emphasis on the collective land rights of indigenous and tribal peoples. States are accordingly obliged to delimit, demarcate, and title indigenous territories, and to refrain from granting concessions over those territories to third parties without free, prior, and informed consent.

This indigenous property rights jurisprudence has been profoundly influential, resonating not only within the Inter-American system but also in the broader development of international indigenous peoples’ rights law, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) adopted in 2007.

3. Mechanism for Enforcement

The traditional mode of enforcing international obligations relating to property, diplomatic protection, requires the state of the investor’s nationality to espouse its national’s claim against the host state. This mechanism, rooted in customary international law, has several well-documented shortcomings: it is entirely discretionary on the part of the espousing state, subject to the satisfaction of conditions including the nationality of claims and the exhaustion of local remedies, and vulnerable to subordination to broader diplomatic considerations.

Similarly, the Inter-American system provides for a two-tier mechanism: petitions are initially submitted to the Inter-

American Commission on Human Rights, which may refer meritorious cases to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights for a binding judgment. The African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights similarly receives communications from individuals and non-governmental organisations, with the possibility of referral to the African Court. These regional mechanisms have made significant contributions to the development of property rights jurisprudence, particularly in relation to indigenous and communal land rights.

3.1. Challenges Against the Instruments

There are several challenges facing the international instrument for the protection of property. These inter alia include Weak Enforcement Mechanisms, State Sovereignty and Domestic Control, Inconsistent Implementation by States, Ambiguity in Legal Provisions, Conflict with Development Policies and Cultural and Communal Land Systems.

3.2. Weak Enforcement Mechanisms

Many international instruments lack strong enforcement powers. Most of them depend on the willingness of states to comply voluntarily. Even when violations occur, international bodies often cannot compel states to obey their decisions. This weak enforcement reduces the practical impact of these instruments.

3.3. State Sovereignty and Domestic Control

States still retain sovereignty over their internal affairs, including land and property regulation. Governments may enact domestic laws that restrict or override international property protections. In many cases, states prioritize national development policies or political interests over international obligations.

3.4. Inconsistent Implementation by States

International property protection instruments require states to incorporate their provisions into domestic law. However, many countries either delay or inadequately implement these standards. Differences in legal systems also lead to uneven application of property rights across countries.

3.5. Ambiguity in Legal Provisions

Some international instruments contain broad or vague language regarding property rights. For example, provisions allowing deprivation of property “in the public interest” may be interpreted differently by states. This ambiguity often creates room for abuse or arbitrary interpretation.

3.6. Conflict with Development Policies

Governments sometimes acquire private property for development projects such as infrastructure, mining, or urban expansion. While international law allows expropriation under certain conditions, disputes often arise regarding fairness of compensation and legality of the acquisition.

3.7. Cultural and Communal Land Systems

In several regions, especially in Africa and indigenous communities, land ownership is communal rather than individual. International instruments sometimes struggle to effectively protect these traditional property systems because many of their provisions are designed around individual ownership models.

Conclusion

There is a compelling case for greater coherence and integration across the different regimes of international property protection. The current fragmentation with human rights, investment law, trade law, and intellectual property law each operating within separate institutional silos generates normative inconsistencies and forum-shopping opportunities that undermine legal certainty and the integrity of the overall system. Greater inter-institutional dialogue and coordination, as well as the incorporation of cross-regime references in treaty drafting, would contribute to greater coherence. Furthermore, international property protection instruments must be interpreted and applied in a manner that gives full effect to their underlying purposes: securing human dignity, promoting economic development, ensuring the rule of law, and balancing the legitimate interests of individuals, communities, and states. Property rights, whether individual or communal, tangible or intangible, are not absolute. They exist in relationship with other rights and values equality, sustainability, access to essential goods, and the right to development — and must be protected and balanced accordingly. As the world grapples with accelerating technological change, the climate crisis, and deepening global inequalities, the international law of property stands at a crossroads.

References

1. Murat, S. Protection of Property Rights in International Law. (2021). *Baltic Journal of Legal and Social Sciences*, (4), 4-13. <<http://baltijapublishing.lv/index.php/bjls/article/view/1408>> accessed 20 January, 2026
2. Anugbum Onuoha, "Land Rights in International Human Rights Instruments: Appraising Nigeria's Compliance" (2020) *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, (99), 4 .
3. Anda C. The Legal Protection of Property Right (2015) Vol.3, Iss.1, SEA - Practical Application of Science <https://seaopenresearch.eu/Journals/articles/SPAS_7_4.pdf> accessed 22 March 2026.
4. John G. Sprankling, The Emergence of International Property Law,(2012) 90 NCLR. 461.
5. Jacob Mchangama 'The Right to Property in Global Human Rights Law' CATO Policy Report Vol.33 No. 3 <<https://www.cato.org/policy-report/may/june-2011/right-property-global-human-rights-law>> accessed 22 March 2026.
6. International Association of Women Judges, Land Rights: Domestic Judges and International Law (2024) <https://www.iawj.org/content.aspx?page_id=2507&club_id=882224&item_id=5367> accessed on the 26 December, 2025
7. Article 17, Universal Declaration of Human Right (1948)
8. Francis Cheneval Property Rights as Human Rights. <<http://www.philosophie.uzh.ch/static/SHRB/PDFs/Kap>> accessed 30 December 2025.
9. United Nation, The Foundation of International Human Rights Law. <<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/udhr/foundation-of-international-human-rights-law#:~:text=The%20Universal%20Declaration%20of%20Human,justice%20for%20all%20of%20us>> Accessed on
10. <https://www.doi.gov/blog/advancing-united-nations-declaration-rights-indigenous-peoples>> accessed 23 February 2026.
11. Birgitte Feiring. Rome. Indigenous Peoples' Rights to Land, Territories and Resources. (2013) International Land Coalition (ILC).
12. Lee SWEPSTON (et al) "International Standards and The Protection of The Land Rights of Indigenous and Tribal Populations"(1985) (Vol. 124, No. 1, International Labour Review). <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://researchrepository.ilo.org/view/pdfCoverPage%3FinstCode%3D41ILO_INST%26filePid%3D13123921790002676%26download%3Dtrue&ved=2ahUKEwiR0u3Mz4TAxW8TUEAHf2FBzsQFnoECGsQAQ&usq=AOvVaw2bvlhK25W9V3JW65nm_Hn> accessed 14 February, 2026.
13. African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Ratification and Enforcement) Act Laws of the Federation of Nigeria (LFN) Cap.A , 2004
14. Eseni Asu Udu (et al) Evaluating the Enforcement of the Rights of Women under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) 1979: The Nigerian Experience. *Beijing Law Review*, Vol.14 No.2, June 2023 .
15. [1987] 9 E.H.R.R. 116 (1987)). 117.
16. The American Convention on Human Rights (1969)